



10-04-05

AP  
2152  
JFW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re application of:  
Lyle Bate

§ Attorney Docket No.: 26530.4 (IDR-338)

§

§

Serial No.: 09/450,867

§ Customer No.: 27683

§

Filed: November 30, 1999

§ Group Art Unit: 2152

§

For: CACHING AND ACCESSING  
RIGHTS IN A DISTRIBUTED  
COMPUTING SYSTEM

§ Examiner: Willett, Stephan F.

§

§

**REPLY BRIEF ON APPEAL**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

This Reply Brief is submitted in response to the Examiner's Answer dated August 1, 2005. For reference purposes, the latest list of claims is attached hereto as Appendix A.

**GROUPING OF CLAIMS**

Applicants believe that the Examiner's grouping of the claims is incorrect. Regarding the Examiner's suggested grouping of the claims submitted in the Examiner's Answer dated August 1, 2005, the Examiner simply recited the assertions made in the Examiner's answer dated December 9, 2004. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments presented in the Applicants' Reply Brief dated February 9, 2005 are sufficient to address the Applicants' position that the Examiner's suggested claim grouping is incorrect. Therefore, Applicants believe that for purposes of this appeal, the grouping of claims should be as follows:

As to the rejection of claims 1-7 and 10, the rejected claims stand or fall together.

As to the rejection of claims 11-14, the rejected claims stand or fall together.

As to the rejection of claims 15-18, the rejected claims stand or fall together.

As to the rejection of claims 23-28, the rejected claims stand or fall together.

As to the rejection of claims 29-38, the rejected claims stand or fall together.

## ARGUMENT

### **A. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Regarding the rejections of claims 1 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, the Examiner simply recited the previous rejections from the Final Office Action, and failed to respond to Applicants' argument that the use of "principal" to represent "software principal" is sufficiently clear in the context of the claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections should be withdrawn.

Regarding the rejection of claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 and in response to the Examiner's response number 15 (page 9 of the Examiner's Answer dated December 9, 2004), Applicants respectfully submit that "the principal is terminated" is clear and supported by page 15, line 24 to page 16, line 3 of the specification. It is clear from Fig. 3 and the above-cited specification that "no longer present on the system" means "terminated." Specifically, Fig. 3 illustrates that once the deputy 302 is "terminated," it is no longer present on the system. Moreover, in accordance with well settled Patent Office practice, description of the claimed subject matter provided by the application figures is sufficient for compliance with the written description requirement. ("[I]t does not seem, under established procedure of long standing, approved by this court, to be of any legal significance whether the disclosure is found in the specification or in the drawings so long as it is there." *In re Wolfensperger*, 301 F.2d 950, 133 USPQ 537 (C.C.P.A. 1962)). Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection should be withdrawn.

### **B. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Since the Examiner simply recited previous rejections from the Final Office Action (with minor variations) and from the Examiner's Answer dated December 9, 2004 with respect to all the pending claims, Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments

presented in the Applicants' Brief are sufficient to overcome those rejections, and in further consideration of the following arguments.

1. Claim 1

With regard to the claim 1 limitation of "receiving, at the access control list cache, a request from the principal for the access rights stored in the access control list cache," the Examiner stated the following:

O'Connor teaches receiving a request from a software principle, col. 7, lines 65-67.

Examiner's Answer dated August 1, 2005, page 7.

Applicants respectfully disagree. The Examiner has ignored the explicit claim limitation that defines the request as a request "for the access rights stored in the access control list cache." The passage of O'Connor (and accompanying detailed description of O'Connor) cited by the Examiner as allegedly disclosing the claim 1 limitation of "receiving, at the access control list cache, a request from the principal for the access rights stored in the access control list cache" states the following:

At step 204, a user desiring access to one or more of the hosts *registers to receive access authorization* to the desired host or hosts. The term "user" may include multiple persons that meet the access criteria and that share a communication terminal. In a preferred embodiment, the prospective user appears in person at a predetermined location and *provides personal data verifying that the user meets predetermined requirements* to gain access to the desired host or hosts. More information than is currently required may be taken to accommodate future requirements, including access to new and different hosts, to avoid requiring the user to return to the predetermined location.

O'Connor, Column 7, Line 65-Column 8, Line 9 (*Emphasis added*).

Additionally, O'Connor states the following:

Once the *user has provided sufficient information* to indicate that the user meets required criteria for access to a host, the user may receive special software required to gain access to the host.

O'Connor, Column 7, Lines 29 (*Emphasis added*).

Thus, O'Connor only discloses a user registering to receive or obtain access authorization. O'Connor in no manner describes receipt of "a request from the principle for the access rights." Rather, the user as disclosed by O'Connor only registers to

receive authorization to access a desired host, e.g., by providing *personal data* or other *sufficient information* verifying the user meets predetermined criteria. No description or suggestion is disclosed by O'Connor for receiving "a request...for the access rights" from the principle. Rather, O'Connor simply describes a user providing authentication information required for access to a host. For at least this reason, O'Connor is insufficient to disclose the claim 1 limitation of "receiving, at the access control list cache, a request from the principal for the access rights stored in the access control list cache."

**C. EXAMINER'S RESPONSE TO APPLICANTS' BRIEF**

1. Number 17 of The Examiner's Response (Pages 11-12) of the Examiner's Answer Dated August 1, 2005

With regard to the claim 1 limitation of "delegating one or more of the principal's access rights to at least one software entity" the Examiner has stated the following:

O'Connor teaches enabling the principal to delegate rights to an entity as "the host acts on the user's instructions...indicating what information the user wishes the host to retrieve", col. 11, lines 18-21, and col. 12, lines 54-56

Examiner's Answer dated 8/01/2005, page 7.

Here, the Examiner has apparently alleged that the host (element 110 in Figure 1 of O'Connor) discloses the subject claim limitation of the *software entity* and has access rights of the *user (principal)* delegated thereto. Applicants respectfully disagree. For example, the passage of O'Connor cited by the Examiner as allegedly disclosing the claim 1 step of "delegating one or more of the principal's access rights to at least one software entity" recites the following:

At step 214, the host acts on the user's instructions. These instructions may include, but are not limited to, indicating what information the user wishes the host to retrieve, what services (e.g., gaming services) the user wants the host to...

O'Connor, Column 11, Lines 18-21.

Applicants have previously noted that O'Connor is only describing a host acting on a user's instructions and does not teach or suggest the delegation of rights to enable a software entity to access a resource using the delegated access rights without requiring intervention or control by the principal (Brief on Appeal, August 17, 2004, page 9). Applicants further note that the host, as described by O'Connor, as acting "on the user's instructions" is necessarily precluded from "accessing the resource...using the delegated access rights without requiring intervention of the principal" as described in the subject application and explicitly recited in claim 1. Therefore, the host described by O'Connor is clearly insufficient to describe the software entity that has "the principal's access rights" delegated thereto and that accesses "the resource" using the delegated access rights "without requiring intervention of the principal" as described in the subject application and explicitly claimed in claim 1.

2. Number 20 of The Examiner's Response (Pages 11-12) of the Examiner's Answer Dated August 1, 2005 and Pages 13-14

The Examiner stated the following:

Obviously, if the principle has delegated their rights, then further "intervention" by the principle is not required. Also, the principle's intervention was not required to access the rights in the first place, thus further intervention by the principle would not be required. *Gatekeeper functions do not require principal control* such as "by performing software program", col. 7, lines 24-25. Lastly, after reviewing the specification, this claim limitation is not disclosed. Thus, Applicant's arguments can not be held as persuasive regarding patentability.

Examiner's Answer dated August 1, 2005, page 14 (Emphasis added).

Here, the Examiner apparently alleges that the *Gatekeeper* (element 108 in Figure 1 of O'Connor) discloses a *software entity* that accesses resources without requiring intervention of the *principal*. However, the Examiner has not even alleged that O'Connor discloses "delegating one or more" access rights of a principle to the Gatekeeper. (As noted above, the Examiner has alleged that access rights are delegated to a host). Thus, the Gatekeeper, as disclosed by O'Connor, is clearly insufficient to disclose a software entity that has "one or more of the principal's access rights" delegated thereto and that accesses the resource "using the delegated access rights without requiring intervention of the principal" as explicitly claimed in claim 1.

Additionally, the Examiner stated the following:

Lastly, after reviewing the specification, this claim limitation is not disclosed. Thus, Applicant's arguments can not be held as persuasive regarding patentability.

Examiner's Answer dated August 1, 2005, page 14.

Applicants respectfully disagree. The application makes clear that an entity having delegated access rights to resources may access the resources without involvement of the principle. (See, for example, application Page 15, Lines 13-17 and 25-26).

3. Numbers 15-16 and 19, and 21-22 Of The Examiner's Response (Pages 9-15)  
Of The Examiner's Answer Dated December 9, 2004)

Since the Examiner simply recited previous arguments from the Examiner's Answer dated December 9, 2004 with respect to the Examiner's response to the Applicants' brief, Applicants respectfully submit that the arguments presented in the Applicants' Reply Brief dated February 9, 2005 are sufficient to address the Examiner's response.

**Conclusion**

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that neither O'Connor nor Chang teaches or suggests the subject matter of claims 1-7, 10-18 and 23-38. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that it is improper to combine the references because there is no motivation or suggestion for such combination to achieve the Applicants' claimed elements.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-7, 10-18 and 23-38 be allowed. A prompt notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account Number 08-1394.

Respectfully submitted,

*T. F. Bliss*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy F. Bliss  
Registration No. 50,925  
Attorney for Applicants

Date: October 3, 2005  
Haynes and Boone, LLP  
901 Main Street, Suite 3100  
Dallas, TX 75202-3789  
(972) 739-8638  
R-117624

EXPRESS MAIL NO.:EV 622991309 US

DATE OF DEPOSIT: October 3, 2005

This paper and fee are being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service Express Mail Post Office to Addressee service under 37 CFR §1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

*Gayle Conner*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gayle Conner

## APPENDIX A

1. A method for caching and accessing access rights to at least one resource in a distributed computing system, the method comprising:

accessing, by a software agent, a directory service, wherein the agent is located on a deputization point coupled to the directory service, and wherein the directory service comprises the access rights of a software principal to a resource;

updating, by the agent, the access rights in an access control list cache, wherein the access control list cache is coupled to the deputization point and to the principal;

receiving, at the access control list cache, a request from the principal for the access rights stored in the access control list cache;

retrieving, from the access control list cache, the access rights;

forwarding, to the principal, the access rights;

delegating one or more of the principal's access rights to at least one software entity; and

accessing the resource, by the software entity, using the delegated access rights without requiring intervention of the principal to authenticate access requests by the software entity, wherein tasks can be accomplished by the software entity without control by the principal.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein the access control list cache is comprised of a first table comprising the principal that has access to the resource.

3. The method of claim 1, wherein the access control list cache is comprised of a second table comprising the access rights of the principal to the resource.

4. The method of claim 1, wherein the access control list cache is comprised of a third table comprising a cached access to the resource object.

5. The method of claim 2 further comprising invoking, by the directory service, a resource manager, if the first table does not contain the principal that has access to the resource, wherein the resource manager is coupled to the directory

service and comprises access information and access rights of the principal to the resource.

6. The method of claim 5 further comprising mapping, by the resource manager, an access control of the access rights in the resource manager to an access control of the rights in the directory service.

7. The method of claim 6 further comprising updating, by the resource manager, the mapped access control of the access rights to the access control list cache.

8 and 9 (Cancelled).

10. The method of claim 1, further comprising at least one of the following actions from the group consisting of:

asynchronously updating, by the agent to the access control list cache, the access rights, when the access rights are added to the directory service;

asynchronously updating, by the agent to the access control list cache, the access rights, when the access rights are removed from the directory service;

asynchronously updating, by the agent to the access control list cache, the access rights, when the request from the principal is received;

synchronously updating, by the agent to the access control list cache, the access rights, when the access rights are added to the directory service;

synchronously updating, by the agent to the access control list cache, the access rights, when the access rights are removed from the directory service;

synchronously updating, by the agent to the access control list cache, the access rights, when the request from the principal is received;

updating, at a scheduled time, the access rights by the agent to the access control list cache; and

updating, after a time to live has expired, the access rights by the agent to the access control list cache.

11. A distributed computing system supporting access control caching, the system comprises:

- a plurality of computers, each having a memory and a processor;
- a plurality of communication links connecting the plurality of computers;
- a principal located on a first one of the computers;
- an agent located on a second one of the computers;
- a resource located on a third one of the computers;
- a first set of access rights located on a fourth one of the computers;
- a second set of access rights located on a fifth one of the computers;

means for accessing, by the agent, the first set of access rights of the principal to the resource;

means for updating, by the agent, the first set of access rights to an access control list cache, wherein the access control list cache is located on a sixth one of the computers;

means for receiving, at the access control list cache, a request from the principal for the first set of access rights;

means for retrieving, by the access control list cache, the first set of access rights;

means for forwarding, to the principal, the first set of access rights; and

means for providing, to the principal, a deputization certificate adapted for enabling the principal to copy one or more of the principal's access rights to at least one software entity.

12. The system of claim 11 further comprises means for invoking the second set of access rights, if the first set of access rights is not located on the fourth one of the computers.

13. The system of claim 12 further comprises means for mapping an access control of the second set of access rights to an access control of the first set of access rights.

14. The system of claim 13 further comprises, means for updating the access control list cache with the mapped access control of the first set of access rights.

15. A computer storage medium having a configuration that represents data and instructions which will cause performance of method steps for caching and accessing access rights in a distributed computing system, the method comprising:

accessing, by a software agent, a directory service, wherein the agent is located on a deputization point coupled to the directory service having the access rights of at least one principal to at least one resource;

updating, by the agent, the access rights to an access control list cache, wherein the access control list cache is coupled to the deputization point, and wherein the access control list cache is coupled to the principal;

receiving, at the access control list cache, a request from the principal for the access rights;

retrieving, by the access control list cache, the access rights;

forwarding, to the principal, the access rights;

forwarding, to the principal, a deputization credential empowering the principal to deputize software entities; and

deputizing, by the principal, at least one of the software entities, wherein the software entity can exercise one or more of the principal's access rights due to the deputization.

16. The configured storage medium of claim 15 further comprising invoking, by the directory service, a resource manager, if the access control list cache does not contain one of the access rights, wherein the resource manager is coupled to the directory service, and wherein the resource manager comprises the one right.

17. The configured storage medium of claim 16 further comprising mapping, by the resource manager, an access control of the one right to an access control of the access rights.

18. The configured storage medium of claim 17 further comprising updating, by the resource manager, the mapped access control of the access rights to the access control list cache.

19-22 (Cancelled).

23. A method for controlling access within a computer system using deputization, the method comprising:

receiving an access authorization request at a deputization point from a principal, wherein the access authorization request requests validation of the principal's identity;

determining whether to validate the principal based on the access authorization request;

identifying one or more resource access permissions for the principal if the principal is validated, wherein the resource access permissions enable the principal to access one or more resources; and

providing the principal with deputizing authority at the identified access authorization level, wherein the deputizing authority comprises a deputization credential that enables the principal to give at least one software entity within the computer system a level of resource access permission equal to or lesser than the principal's resource access permissions.

24. The method of claim 23 wherein determining whether to validate the principal includes comparing information present in the access authorization request to a plurality of access rights contained in an access control list cache.

25. (Previously presented): The method of claim 24 further comprising:

invoking a resource manager if the access control list cache does not contain an access right associated with the access authorization request;

locating the access right associated with the access authorization request; and mapping the access right into the plurality of access rights.

26. The method of claim 23 further comprising deputizing, by the principal, a first software entity, wherein the first software entity has a level of resource access permission equal to or lesser than the principal's resource access permissions.

27. The method of claim 26 wherein deputizing includes defining a lifespan of the deputization.

28. The method of claim 26 further comprising deputizing, by the first software entity, a second software entity, wherein the second software entity has a level of resource access permission equal to or lesser than the first software entity's level of resource access permission.

29. A computer-executable method for delegating permission from a software principal to a software deputy within a computer network to access at least one resource that is accessible to the principal, the method comprising:

receiving a request from the principal for a deputy credential, wherein the request includes the principal's identity and at least one permission to be assigned to the deputy;

sending the deputy credential to the principal, wherein the deputy credential enables the principal to assign the permission to the resource to the deputy;

receiving a deputization request from the principal to assign the permission to the deputy; and

assigning the permission to the deputy, wherein the deputy can independently access the resource using the assigned permission without being controlled by the principal.

30. The method of claim 29 further comprising imposing a lifespan on the assignment of the permission, wherein the assignment will expire at the end of the lifespan.

31. The method of claim 29 further comprising imposing a lifespan on the deputy, wherein the deputy will terminate at the end of the lifespan.

32. The method of claim 29 further comprising:  
determining if a deputy identified in the deputization exists; and  
creating the deputy if the deputy does not exist.

33. The method of claim 32 further comprising identifying a start time in the deputization request for assigning the permission to the deputy, wherein the permission is not assigned to the deputy until the start time.

34. The method of claim 33 wherein the principal is terminated in the computer network prior to the start time.

35. The method of claim 29 further comprising verifying that the principal is permitted to access the resource prior to sending the deputy credential to the principal.

36. The method of claim 29 wherein the deputy is in a namespace that is not accessible to the principal, and wherein the deputy can use the permission to access a resource in the namespace that is not accessible to the principal.

37. The method of claim 29 wherein the request from the principal for a deputy credential includes a plurality of permissions to be assigned to the deputy, and wherein the deputy credential sent to the principal permits the principal to assign only a portion of the plurality of permissions to the deputy.

38. The method of claim 29 further comprising  
receiving a second request from the principal for a second deputy credential, wherein the request includes the principal's identity and at least a second permission to be assigned to the deputy;  
sending the second deputy credential to the principal; and

assigning the second permission contained in the second deputy credential to the deputy, wherein the deputy includes permissions from both the deputy credential and the second deputy credential.